arXiv:1607.03721v1 [hep-th] 13 Jul 2016

Emergent horizon, Hawking radiation and chaos in the collapsed polymer model of a black hole

Ram Brustein[(1)], A.J.M. Medved[(2,3)]

(1) Department of Physics, Ben-Gurion University, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel
(2) Department of Physics & Electronics, Rhodes University, Grahamstown 6140, South Africa
(3) National Institute for Theoretical Physics (NITheP), Western Cape 7602, South Africa

ramyb@bgu.ac.il, j.medved@ru.ac.za

Abstract

We have proposed that the interior of a macroscopic Schwarzschild black hole (BH) consists of highly excited, long, closed, interacting strings and, as such, can be modeled as a collapsed polymer. It was previously shown that the scaling relations of the collapsed-polymer model agree with those of the BH. The current paper further substantiates this proposal with an investigation into some of its dynamical consequences. In particular, we show that the model predicts, without relying on gravitational effects, an emergent horizon. We further show that the horizon fluctuates quantum mechanically as it should and that the strength of the fluctuations is inversely proportional to the BH entropy. It is then demonstrated that the emission of Hawking radiation is realized microscopically by the quantum-induced escape of small pieces of string, with the rate of escape and the energy per emitted piece both parametrically matching the Hawking temperature. We also show, using standard methods from statistical mechanics and chaos theory, how our model accounts for some other known properties of BHs. These include the accepted results for the scrambling time and the viscosity-to-entropy ratio, which in our model apply not only at the horizon but throughout the BH interior.

1 Introduction

The traditional narrative, based on classical general relativity, is that the interior of a Schwarzschild black hole (BH) is a region of mostly empty space surrounding a highly dense, very small and classically singular core. It has recently been suggested that this picture is not only flawed but spectacularly incorrect. This current narrative can be simply summarized: There is no interior to even consider. Spacetime rather ends at the BH horizon either as a matter of principle, as in the fuzzball model of BHs [1, 2, 3, 4] (also [5]), or in practice, as a "firewall" of high-energy particles surrounding the horizon [6] (also [7, 8, 9]). We, however, have been advocating a rather different point of view: The interior exists and is not empty; it is rather filled with a hot bath of long, closed, interacting strings [10]. Such an interior cannot be described in terms of a semiclassical spacetime metric, and we have proposed that the appropriate description of this state is in terms of a collapsed polymer.

The basis for our reasoning is that the interior of a BH must be in a highly quantum state when it is described in terms of the spacetime fields at infinity [11]. Accepting that BHs evolve in a unitary manner and that they can be in a (nearly) pure state, it follows that the interior state must be the purifier of the emitted Hawking radiation. Therefore, the non-vanishing eigenvalues of the density matrix of the emitted radiation and those of the interior state are equal. The emitted radiation is in a highly quantum state because the emission rate of BHs is equal to the inverse of the wavelength of the emitted radiation. This is distinct from standard black bodies, such as the Sun, for which the emission rates are much larger than the inverse of the radiation wavelengths. Therefore, the emitted radiation from BHs is charac-

terized by its small occupation numbers in the basis of the asymptotic fields. It follows that the state of the interior must, similarly, posses small occupation numbers. Further, if a mean-field description of this state does exist, it must be in terms of a strongly correlated system or, equivalently, an entropically dominated one to account for the BH's unorthodox thermodynamics; in particular, its non-extensive entropy and energy.

Once it is accepted that the BH interior does have such properties, one is almost inevitably led to a high-temperature theory of fundamental strings. As has been frequently discussed in the literature (*e.g.*, [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]), the partition function for such a theory has an exponentially large number of closely packed states and its canonical ensemble is subject to large fluctuations that diverge at the Hagedorn temperature. In other words, this is a theory of highly quantum matter. Moreover, the equation of state for high-temperature string theory is famously $p = \rho$, which is equivalent to $s = \sqrt{\rho}$ in suitable units. (p, ρ and s are respectively pressure, energy density and entropy density.) Thus, s is as large as it can be in comparison to ρ, implying entropic dominance.

What we have proposed is that the BH interior should be modeled as a Schwarzschild-sized, bound and metastable (but classically stable) state of interacting, long, closed strings at a temperature of about the Hagedorn temperature. As discussed at length in [18, 19] and summarized in [10], the resulting picture is one in which the bound state is dominated by $\ln N$ long strings, where N is the total length of the strings in string units (or, equivalently, the number of "string bits"). This picture differs somewhat from the commonly held view that a single long string is entropically favored. The

latter scenario applies only when the strings are placed in a very large volume. The difference then comes about from finite-volume effects modifying the corresponding equilibrium state.

Our proposal is different than the traditional BH–string correspondence [20, 21, 22], for which the duality between BH and string thermodynamics depends on having a BH whose Schwarzschild radius R_S matches the fundamental string length l_s. But this requirement cannot possibly apply to macroscopic BHs. The main difference between our proposal and the BH–string correspondence is that, in our setup, there are two distinct scales of energy. One scale is the string-tension energy, which is given by $E_{ten} = N/l_s$ and is the microscopic energy that would be attributed to a single free string of total length Nl_s. This energy scale is related via the first law to the Hagedorn temperature $T_{Hag} = 1/l_s$ and the string entropy N. [1] The other scale is the bound-state energy E_{bound} which, together with the tension energy, accounts for the interaction energy E_{int} of the strings, $E_{bound} = E_{ten} - E_{int}$. This is the energy that an external observer measures, having no direct access to the interior. So that, if l_P is the Planck length and $M_{BH} = (1/l_P)\,(R_S/l_P)^{d-2}$ is the mass of the BH, our proposal requires that $M_{BH} = E_{net} < E_{ten}$, rather than a correspondence point where $M_{BH} = E_{ten}$ as in [20, 21, 22].

But how much smaller is E_{bound} than E_{ten}? The answer can be found by appealing to criteria for the existence of a metastable, bound state. First, to parametrize the desired ratio, let us write $E_{bound} = \epsilon E_{ten}$. Then, in units with $l_s = 1$, $E_{bound} = \epsilon N$. Let us then recall from [18, 19] that $g^2 N/V$

[1] We mostly leave out order-unity numerical factors and fundamental constants, often set $l_s = 1$ and assume $d+1$ dimensions with $d \geq 3$.

is the measure of the strength of the interactions. Here, $g^2 = (l_P/l_s)^{d-1}$ is the string coupling and V is the volume occupied by the strings. Let us next recall from [10] that the state is in equilibrium when the relation $\epsilon = g^2 N/V$ is satisfied. Now, as also discussed in [10], if $g^2 N/V < 1/R_S$, then the state cannot be bound and, if $g^2 N/V > 1/R_S$, it cannot resist further collapse. It follows that

$$g^2 \frac{N}{V} \;=\; \frac{1}{R_S} \tag{1}$$

and, therefore,

$$\epsilon \;=\; \frac{l_s}{R_S}\,. \tag{2}$$

In units in which $l_s = 1$ and using only the dimensionless parameters g^2 and ϵ, we then arrive at the following dictionary: The volume is given by

$$V \;=\; \frac{1}{\epsilon^d}\,, \tag{3}$$

the entropy by

$$S_{BH} \;=\; N \;=\; V\frac{\epsilon}{g^2}\,, \tag{4}$$

the tension energy by

$$E_{ten} \;=\; N \;=\; V\frac{\epsilon}{g^2} \tag{5}$$

and, correspondingly,

$$T_{Hag} \;=\; 1\,. \tag{6}$$

The total (bound-state) energy is

$$M_{BH} \;=\; E_{bound} \;=\; V\frac{\epsilon^2}{g^2} \tag{7}$$

and, correspondingly, the Hawking temperature is

$$T_{Haw} \;=\; \frac{E_{bound}}{N} \;=\; \epsilon\,. \tag{8}$$

In spite of the implicit presence of Planck's constant in its numerator, the Hawking temperature depends only on ϵ and not on g^2. This is so because Newton's constant cancels out of the ratio M_{BH}/S_{BH}.

Let us also recall that the size of a free string of a fixed length N in string units is $\sqrt{N} = 1/g\epsilon^{(d-1)/2}$, which follows from a random-walk scaling. Hence, the the bound-state size of $1/\epsilon$ is smaller than the free-string size by a factor of $g\epsilon^{(d-3)/2} \ll 1$; meaning that the interactions are important. But, as discussed in [10], higher-than-leading-order string interactions can still be neglected provided that $\frac{Ng^2}{V} \ll 1$, which translates into the constraint $\epsilon \ll 1$ or $R_S \gg 1$.

How does the equation of state $s = \sqrt{\rho}$ arise from both the BH and string-theory point of view? For the BH, we simply insist that the interior matter is compactified as much as possible while still respecting the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy–area law [23, 24] for any interior, closed surface. This constraint yields

$$s(r) = \frac{1}{g^2 r} , \tag{9}$$

$$\rho(r) = \frac{1}{g^2 r^2} . \tag{10}$$

For an effective description of the stringy bound state, we have employed a standard form of free energy for a collapsed polymer (*e.g.*, [25]); this is recalled in Eq. (12). The aforementioned equilibrium condition can then be recast in terms of the polymer concentration, $c = N/V = \epsilon/g^2$. Since $\epsilon = 1/R_S \sim 1/r$, one can cut off the polymer at some radius r satisfying $\epsilon \ll r < R_S$ to obtain the same scaling as in Eq. (9). Similar reasoning applies to the energy density.

The same equation of state $s = \sqrt{\rho}$ signals the saturation of the causal entropy bound [26] which implies, in turn, the breakdown of semiclassical physics [27]. In this way, one can see how the notions of highly quantum and entropically dominant are indeed synonymous.

We would now like to go beyond the thermodynamic scaling relations and find out whether other known features of BHs are shared by the collapsed-polymer model. This is the purpose of the current paper.

The most prominent feature of a BH is that it has a horizon; a classically causal barrier to the external world. Further, as was argued by Bekenstein [23] and later proved by Hawking, matter can still break through this barrier but can only do so quantum mechanically. What we would then like to understand is if (and how) a horizon emerges from the perspective of the polymer and, if it does, how the quantum-mechanical process of the emission of Hawking radiation comes about. A crucial consistency check for our model is that the emission of Hawking particles should occur at both a rate and energy release that matches T_{Haw}. We would also like to know if the emergent horizon fluctuates quantum mechanically and, if so, compare the strength of these fluctuations to that of previous works [28, 29, 30].

Another distinctive feature of BHs is that they are maximally fast scramblers of information [31, 32, 33]. This leads to another important litmus test for our model: It must reproduce the minimally allowed scrambling time. This is basically the same as realizing the maximum possible value of the Lyapunov exponent, which also makes BHs the most chaotic of all systems [34]. Closely related to the idea of a BH being an ideal scrambler and maximally chaotic is that its viscosity-to-entropy ratio is minimized [35, 36, 37],

thus providing another essential check.

The remainder of the paper puts our model to the test by investigating these very questions. We find that it passes all of them with "flying colors", providing a direct and simple physical explanation in all cases.

2 Emerging horizon and Hawking radiation

As a gravitational concept, the horizon is a geometric expression of the fact that, classically, matter cannot escape from a BH. Quantum mechanically, we expect two related effects to modify this conclusion.

First, we expect the position of the horizon to fluctuate. The location of a BH horizon is a physical observable since it is is measurable in principle. This is made clear in [38], where it is explained how an observer in a finite-sized laboratory can detect the horizon by measuring nearby tidal effects. This conclusion evades violating Einstein's equivalence principle because the principle is only relevant to ultra-local measurements. Then, like any other physical observable, the position of the horizon is subject to quantum fluctuations.

We have previously shown [28, 29, 30] that the quantum variance of R_S scales as

$$\frac{(\Delta R_S)^2}{\langle R_S \rangle^2} \simeq \frac{1}{S_{BH}} \,. \tag{11}$$

This is a general result that is applicable in any dimension and follows from simple quantum-mechanical considerations. That $1/S_{BH}$ acts as a dimensionless $\hbar$ is also apparent in the context of the AdS/CFT duality: The quantity that controls the strength of quantum fluctuations on the field-theory side is

$1/\mathcal{N}^2$, which on the gravity side corresponds to $1/S_{BH}$ (here, $\mathcal{N}$ is the rank of the gauge group).

The second effect is that of Hawking radiation. Quantum mechanically, matter can escape from the BH due to the Hawking process. The rate and average energy of the escaped particles is determined by the size of the BH, R_S.

The purpose of this section is to verify that this general picture can be reproduced from the specific microscopic model which describes the collapsed polymer. This means establishing the emergence of a classical horizon that fluctuates quantum mechanically and with the same variance as in Eq. (11). In practice, this requires showing that the only opportunity for strings to escape from the bound state is via a quantum-mechanical effect, and that the corresponding rate and energy of emission are correct. Since the microscopic model does not contain gravity explicitly, this constitutes a highly non-trivial check on the viability of our proposal for the interior.

2.1 Emerging Horizon

Classically, meaning to zeroth order in the coupling g^2, there is no process by which a piece of the polymer can be detached from the main body, as all interactions depend on the presence of g^2 [18, 19]. This is the simplest expression of a horizon, as the escape velocity of a piece must be infinitely large as long as it is still connected to the polymer. The only question in this case is how far away can the piece get? Can it or can it not still escape to infinity for all practical purposes? A related question is to what extent is the size of the polymer well defined? And so the extent to which pieces of the

polymer can protrude away from the main body, in relation to its diameter $2R_S$, can be viewed as a more precise criterion for the existence of a horizon. What we then need to estimate is the strength of fluctuations in the position of the horizon and check that it is sufficiently small.

To this end, let us recall from [10] the free energy F of a collapsed polymer in terms of the polymer concentration c and also that $c = N/V$ at equilibrium. The expression for F is (with $l_s = 1$)

$$-\frac{F}{\epsilon} \;=\; cV - \frac{1}{2}V\frac{g^2}{\epsilon}c^2 \;+\; \mathcal{O}[c^3]\;. \tag{12}$$

The parameter ϵ plays the role of an effective (dimensionless) temperature for the bound state since $\epsilon = E_{bound}/N$.

Since c is conjugate to the volume V in Eq. (12), we can use standard statistical mechanics to determine the variance of the volume fluctuations by twice varying the free energy with respect to the polymer concentration. That is,

$$(\Delta V)^2 \;=\; \frac{\partial^2(F/\epsilon)}{\partial c^2} \;=\; \frac{Vg^2}{\epsilon}\;. \tag{13}$$

Using the equilibrium relation in Eq. (5), $\epsilon = g^2N/V$, and dividing through by V^2, one can now obtain

$$\frac{(\Delta V)^2}{V^2} \;=\; \frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{S_{BH}}\;. \tag{14}$$

Then, by way of the chain rule, the boundary or horizon fluctuations scale according to

$$\frac{(\Delta R_S)^2}{R_S^2} \;\simeq\; \frac{1}{N}\;, \tag{15}$$

just as expected for a BH with an entropy of N. Clearly, this is the smallest possible variance, being that it is proportional to $1/S_{BH}$, the dimensionless $\hbar$.

2.2 Hawking radiation

Throughout this subsection, we use units in which $l_s = 1$.

To begin, let us present a Boltzmann-like equation for interacting, closed strings that was first discussed in [19] and later reviewed in [10]:

$$\frac{dn(\ell)}{dt} = \frac{g^2}{V}\Big[-\frac{1}{2}\ell^2 n(\ell) - \int_0^\infty d\ell'\ \ell' n(\ell')\ell n(\ell) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\ell d\ell'\ \ell'(\ell-\ell')n(\ell')n(\ell-\ell') + \int_\ell^\infty d\ell'\ \ell' n(\ell')\Big] , \tag{16}$$

where $n(\ell)$ is the average number of strings of length ℓ, each of the four terms on the right represents a different type of leading-order (three-string) interaction and an overall numerical factor has been dropped. This equation is referenced below; however, it also makes it clear that any interaction between strings requires $g^2 > 0$.

The viability of quantum escape can be determined in two steps: By, first, calculating the rate at which small strings escape and, second, determining the suppression factor for the rate of escape of longer strings with respect to the small strings.

To address the first step, let us start by recalling that the equilibrium solution of Eq. (16) for the string-number function is [19]

$$n(\ell) = \ell^{-1} e^{-\frac{\ell}{L}} , \tag{17}$$

where L is the expectation value of the total length of string (*i.e.*, $L = N$ in string units). It follows that, on average, the number of the shortest strings – loops of unit length – is given by $n(1) = 1$. We can therefore assume that there is only a single short string at any given time.

The probability that a short string can survive its journey from an arbitrary location in the polymer to the outer surface depends mainly on its mean-free-path length l_{mfp}. Once a small string does safely reach the surface, it has an order-unity probability of escaping if its velocity contains an outward component. On the other hand, if the short string instead interacts, it will join onto a longer string, and whether or not this longer loop can make it to the surface is a case which will be discussed separately.

It is easier to begin with the mean-free-path time, $t_{mfp} = l_{mfp}/v_{CoM}$ with v_{CoM} denoting the speed of the string's center of mass. The mean-free-path time for a string of length ℓ can be determined by way of the following relation:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} \;=\; \frac{g^2 N}{V} E(\ell)\;, \tag{18}$$

where the left-hand side is the power absorbed by the string because of interactions and $E(\ell) \propto \ell$ is its energy. An expression of this basic form follows from $g^2 N/V$ measuring the overall strength of the interactions and from the interaction rate of any given string being proportional to its length [18, 19].

We can estimate t_{mfp} for a short string by defining it as the time when the absorbed energy becomes of the same order as its original energy $E(1)$. This will happen when

$$t_{mfp} \;\simeq\; \frac{V}{Ng^2} \;=\; \frac{1}{\epsilon}\;, \tag{19}$$

where we have recalled the equilibrium condition $V/Ng^2 = 1/\epsilon$ from Section 1. Since a string with a length of order one can be regarded as relativistic, it follows that

$$l_{mfp} \;=\; t_{mfp} \;\simeq\; \frac{1}{\epsilon} \tag{20}$$

for the shortest strings.

As $1/\epsilon = R_S$, this last result means that a short string has an order-one probability of making to the surface. And, since there is (on average) only one such string at any given time, the rate of escape of the short strings is just the inverse of the mean-free-path time, $1/t_{mfp} = \epsilon$. This is exactly the rate at which BHs emit their radiation because $T_{Haw} = \epsilon$ determines the emission rate of the Hawking particles. And so the rate of escape of strings whose length is of order one is

$$\frac{1}{t_{mfp}} \simeq T_{Haw} . \tag{21}$$

We can therefore conclude that the emission of Hawking radiation is a consequence of the smallest possible loops of string (on the order of one string length) escaping from the collapsed polymer. This fits well with energetic considerations, as a single bit of string will carry a net energy of about

$$E_{emitted} = \frac{M_{BH}}{N} = \epsilon = T_{Haw} \tag{22}$$

away from the bound state. Therefore, if only short strings contribute, the rate of energy emission is

$$\frac{dE_{emitted}}{dt} \simeq \epsilon^2 = T_{Haw}^2 . \tag{23}$$

This energy budgeting may seem contradictory to a just-escaped string having a tension of order one. However, once in the exterior spacetime, the string will expend energy as it climbs through the classical gravitational field. In other words, the string is being subjected to the conventional Tolman redshift.

We do not mean, of course, that an escaped string will directly transform into a physical Hawking particle. Once in the exterior, the string is quickly subsumed into the external string condensate which describes the classical gravitational field. The condensate will then rearrange to accommodate this new excitation; an action which is manifested in the physical spacetime as the emission of a Hawking particle. An external observer would naturally attribute this process to one of gravitationally induced pair production [39]. Meanwhile, the internal polymer rearranges to accommodate the loss of the string, finally settling into a new equilibrium state with a slightly lower energy. The external observer would attribute this reduction in energy to the absorption of the negative-energy pair partner of the emitted particle.

What still needs to be checked is the fate of the strings that are parametrically longer than the fundamental string length. If these strings escape at a significant rate, then energy will be leaking faster from the polymer than it would be for a BH. Fortunately, there is a simple statistical argument that ensures that the escape rate of long strings is exponentially suppressed. [2]

We can use entropic considerations to estimate the probability that a long string of length $\ell \gg 1$ detaches from the body of the polymer. A standard argument in statistical mechanics maintains that, near equilibrium, the relative probability of a string of total length L splitting into two disconnected strings — one of length $L - \ell$ and the other of length ℓ — decreases exponentially with the entropy of the detached string, which is equal to its length ℓ in string units. It follows that the probability of detachment goes as

$$\frac{P(L-\ell,\ \ell)}{P(L)} \ \sim \ e^{-\ell}\,. \tag{24}$$

[2] We thank Masanori Hanada for suggesting this argument.

It can be concluded that the total emitted energy from all long strings of any length is suppressed by an exponentially small factor with respect to that of the shortest strings. [3] Therefore, the long strings make a negligible contribution.

3 Chaos, fast scrambling and viscosity

The main objective of this section is to understand how (and if) the collapsed polymer is able to reproduce the maximally fast scrambling rate [31, 32, 33] and the minimally allowed viscosity-to-entropy ratio [35, 36, 37] of a BH. From the BH perspective, these properties pertain to just the horizon, but we will be able to make a novel prediction about the latter one in the interior. The key idea that we use in this section is the standard statistical mechanics relationship between the free energy and the various quantities of interest.

3.1 Chaos and fast scrambling

In the context of BHs, the scrambling time is meant to be the typical time scale for a disturbance that is induced by in-falling matter to disperse over the entire horizon surface. Underlying this definition is the premise that an external observer can never see matter or energy fall into the BH — so that, as far as she is concerned, any such disturbance is forever trapped on

[3] There will also be an additional power-law suppression due to longer strings being fewer in number (*cf*, Eq. (17)), having a shorter mean-free-path length and a non-relativistic velocity.

the horizon. [4] But the internal perspective, which must be adopted in our framework, is necessarily somewhat different and more similar to the way that the scrambling time is defined in systems which can be accessed by an observer.

More generally, the scrambling time can be associated with the time scale for the onset of fully chaotic behavior in a perturbed dynamical system, and it is determined (in part) by the largest positive Lyapunov exponent λ_L. (See, *e.g.*, [34, 40, 41] for recent discussions in the context of BHs.) The exponent λ_L appears in an exponentially growing factor that is associated with the degree of delocalization of an initial disturbance. The "delocalization" is meant to be taking place in phase space and can be quantified in terms of the increasing "distance" between once-neighboring trajectories. The maximal amount of delocalization is set by the size of the accessible region of phase space.

In a quantum theory, one of the standard methods of diagnosing for chaos and then identifying the Lyapunov exponent is to inspect an out-of-time-order four-point function for a suitable choice of unitary operators. With this in mind, we will apply an argument from [40] that reveals how the scrambling time can be deduced for any chaos-prone quantum theory. The starting point is the following observation about chaotic motion in phase space: If $q(t; q_0, p_0)$ and $p(t; q_0, p_0)$ are a canonically conjugate pair describing trajectories in phase space (q_0 and p_0 are their initial values), it can be

[4] It is more conventional to frame the scrambling time in terms of the "stretched horizon", which is taken to be a few Planck lengths outward from the actual horizon.

expected that

$$\frac{\partial q(t)}{\partial q_0} \sim e^{\lambda_L t} . \tag{25}$$

Now suppose that $U(t) = e^{i\alpha q(t)}$ and $V(t) = e^{i\beta p(t)}$, where α and β are dimensional constants. Insofar as α, β, and t are suitably small, then Eq. (25) plus some basic quantum mechanics leads to

$$\langle U^\dagger(t) V^\dagger(0) U(t) V(0) \rangle \sim \exp\left[-i\alpha\beta\hbar \exp\left(\lambda_L t\right)\right] , \tag{26}$$

where we have temporarily restored Planck's constant to emphasize that the product $\alpha\beta$ has units of inverse action. A large phase in an out-of-time-order four-point function can be viewed as a signal of chaotic behavior. Here, the phase becomes order unity when

$$t \sim -\frac{1}{\lambda_L} \ln\left(\alpha\beta\hbar\right) . \tag{27}$$

The scrambling time t_{scr} can be identified as the time for which a disturbance is delocalized throughout phase space. Therefore, t_{scr} can be estimated by identifying the measure of action $(\alpha\beta)^{-1}$ with the size of the phase space in question. Our model has a phase space of size $N\hbar$ since the number of interacting degrees of freedom is N and they all interact with each other in a democratic way, so

$$t_{scr} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda_L} \ln N . \tag{28}$$

What is left is to determine the Lyapunov exponent λ_L. To do this, we will adopt a commonly used method from statistical mechanics which relates the value of the free energy to the Lyapunov exponent. In the standard treatment, one calculates the transfer matrix T (see, for example Sect. 10 of

[42] and [43]) and determines its largest eigenvalue λ_+. The Lyapunov exponent λ_L can then be identified with the logarithm of this largest eigenvalue, $\lambda_L = \ln \lambda_+$ (see, *e.g.*, [44]). The argument uses two different representations of the partition function Z,

$$Z \;=\; tr\; T_1^N \tag{29}$$

and

$$Z \;=\; tr\; e^{-\beta F}\;, \tag{30}$$

where β is the inverse temperature and T_1 is the transfer matrix for a single degree of freedom. The transfer matrix acts in Euclidean time over an interval of length β. The number of degrees of freedom is N, or more generally, the entropy S. For large N,

$$Z \;\sim\; \lambda_+^N \;=\; e^{\beta\lambda_L N}\;. \tag{31}$$

Comparing Eqs. (30) and (31), we see that the Lyapunov exponent can then be expressed in terms of the specific free energy per degree of freedom F/N,

$$\beta\lambda_L \;=\; -\frac{\beta F}{N}\;. \tag{32}$$

Let us recall that the free energy of the polymer can be expressed at equilibrium as

$$-\frac{F}{T_{Hag}N} \;=\; \epsilon - \frac{1}{2}\frac{g^2 N}{V} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \tag{33}$$

and that $\epsilon = 1/R_S$. It can therefore be concluded that

$$\lambda_L \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \;= \frac{1}{2R_S}\;. \tag{34}$$

Using the standard definition of the Hawking temperature $T_{Haw} = 1/(4\pi R_S)$ (which also follows from the free energy in Eq. (33)), we have

$$\lambda_L \;=\; 2\pi T_{Haw}\;. \tag{35}$$

And so the Lyapunov exponent can be identified with the inverse of the Hawking thermal wavelength.

We would like to emphasize that our derivation of the Lyapunov exponent follows from its standard definitions for dynamical systems and does not rely on the ratio of redshifts between different observers. Indeed, gravity never enters into our calculation.

A positive value for $\ln \lambda_+$ means that the maximal eigenvalue of the transfer matrix is larger than unity and serves as a standard indicator of chaotic behavior. Further, for a strongly interacting system at a finite temperature, the Lyapunov exponent should be close to but bounded from above by the inverse of the thermal wavelength [34]. For our model, this bound appears to be saturated, just as expected for a BH.

One can now be conclude, using Eqs. (35) and (28), that the scrambling time for our model is indeed the anticipated expression [31, 32, 33],

$$t_{scr} \;=\; \frac{1}{2\pi T_H} \ln S_{BH} \; . \tag{36}$$

An alternative method for estimating the Lyapunov exponent goes as follows: The inverse of the Lyapunov exponent is associated with the time scale for a system to equilibrate or thermalize. We can estimate this time scale by considering a perturbation away from equilibrium of the distribution of strings for some length of string ℓ_0. Let us then recall the Boltzmann-like equation (16) and consider $n(\ell_0) \to n(\ell_0) + \delta n(\ell_0)$. It can be shown that such a perturbation dissipates in time according to [19]

$$\frac{\delta n(\ell_0, t)}{\delta n(\ell_0, 0)} \;=\; e^{-a\ell_0 \frac{g^2}{V}\left(N + \frac{\ell_0}{2}\right)t} \;\simeq\; e^{-a\ell_0 \frac{g^2 N}{V} t} \; , \tag{37}$$

where a is some order-unity numerical factor in string units.

The longest equilibration time for the string state should be determined by adding the shortest possible string, which means setting $\ell_0 = 1$ in the exponent of Eq. (37). It follows that

$$\lambda_L \;=\; a\frac{g^2 N}{V} \;=\; a\epsilon \;=\; \frac{a}{R_S}\,. \tag{38}$$

Causality requires that $a \leq 1$, and so

$$\lambda_L \;\lesssim\; \frac{1}{R_S}\,. \tag{39}$$

The previous discussion indicates that $a = 1/2$.

3.2 Viscosity to entropy ratio

The discussion in the previous subsection regarding dissipation will enable us to estimate the shear viscosity η for the stringy fluid within the interior. The viscosity can, in general, be identified with the ratio of the energy density $\rho = \epsilon^2/g^2$ and the time scale for dissipation λ_L. So that, in our case,

$$\eta \;\simeq\; \frac{\rho}{\lambda_L} \;=\; \frac{2}{\epsilon}\frac{\epsilon^2}{g^2}\,, \tag{40}$$

where the second equality follows from Eqs. (7) and (35). Using Eq. (1), we have

$$\eta \;\simeq\; \frac{2\epsilon}{g^2} \;=\; 2\frac{N}{V} \;=\; 2s\,. \tag{41}$$

Our conclusion is that the shear viscosity is the same order as the entropy density, $\eta/s \simeq 1$. This is true not only at the horizon, as expected [35, 36, 37], but throughout the entirety of the interior region!

It is amusing to consider the following method for fixing η with precision. For certain physical situations, the shear viscosity of a fluid can be

determined by an expression of what is basically the form (see, *e.g.*, [45])

$$\eta \;=\; 2\frac{T}{\gamma^2}\lambda_L \; s \; , \tag{42}$$

where γ is the shear rate which has dimensions of velocity divided by length.

The maximum possible shear rate is when the velocity is that of light and the length in question is that of the system. In our case, the maximal shear rate would then be given by the inverse radius

$$\gamma_{max} = 1/R_S \; . \tag{43}$$

It could be expected, based on the previous discussion, that the stringy fluid does indeed saturate the maximal value of the shear rate. Then, substituting for λ_L from Eq. (35) and setting $T = T_{Haw}$, we find that

$$\eta \;=\; \frac{1}{4\pi}s \; , \tag{44}$$

which precisely saturates the celebrated bound of Kovtun, Son and Starinets [37]. It follows that the maximal value of λ_L corresponds to the minimal value of η, just as one would anticipate.

This uniform saturation of what is believed to be an absolute lower bound on the viscosity-to-entropy ratio is a novel prediction of our model. It also further supports the notion that the interior of the BH is a place where semiclassical physics breaks down, as the saturation of this lower bound is supposed to be a signature of strongly coupled field theories [34].

4 Conclusion

We have revisited our recent proposal that the BH interior is a bound state of long, highly excited, closed strings or, equivalently, a string-theory version

of a collapsed polymer. After reviewing some of the model's salient features, we introduced several new consistency checks for this paradigm. We showed that the position of the outer surface fluctuates quantum mechanically with the expected relative variance of $1/S_{BH}$. We also demonstrated that the process of Hawking radiation — with its anticipated rate of emission and energy per emitted particle — can be attributed to the quantum effect of small strings escaping from the main body of the polymer . In other words, the BH horizon emerges as a natural feature in the polymer framework.

In addition, we have applied standard methods from statistical mechanics and chaos theory and found values for the Lyapunov exponent, scrambling time and viscosity-to-entropy ratio that saturate their respective bounds and, therefore, agree with the standard expected results for BHs. A novel feature of our model is that the viscosity-to-entropy ratio saturates its minimally allowed value throughout the interior and not just at the horizon. One of our next objectives [46] is to find a novel prediction that could potentially be verified by the (anticipated) data coming from gravitational-wave detectors [47].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Yshai Avishai, Doron Cohen, Guy Gur-Ari, Masanori Hanada and Sunny Itzhaki for valuable discussions. The research of AJMM received support from an NRF Incentive Funding Grant 85353, an NRF Competitive Programme Grant 93595 and Rhodes Research Discretionary Grants. AJMM thanks Ben Gurion University for their hospitality during

his visit.

References

[1] S. D. Mathur, "What Exactly is the Information Paradox?," Lect. Notes Phys. **769**, 3 (2009) [arXiv:0803.2030 [hep-th]].

[2] S. D. Mathur, "The Information paradox: A Pedagogical introduction," Class. Quant. Grav. **26**, 224001 (2009) [arXiv:0909.1038 [hep-th]].

[3] S. D. Mathur, "What the information paradox is *not*," arXiv:1108.0302 [hep-th].

[4] S. D. Mathur, "What does strong subadditivity tell us about black holes?," Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **251-252**, 16 (2014) [arXiv:1309.6583 [hep-th]].

[5] K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, "The fuzzball proposal for black holes," Phys. Rept. **467**, 117 (2008) [arXiv:0804.0552 [hep-th]].

[6] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, "Black Holes: Complementarity or Firewalls?," JHEP **1302**, 062 (2013) [arXiv:1207.3123 [hep-th]].

[7] N. Itzhaki, "Is the black hole complementarity principle really necessary?," arXiv:hep-th/9607028.

[8] S. L. Braunstein, S. Pirandola and K. Zyczkowski, "Entangled black holes as ciphers of hidden information," Physical Review Letters 110, **101301** (2013) [arXiv:0907.1190 [quant-ph]].

[9] D. Marolf and J. Polchinski, "Gauge/Gravity Duality and the Black Hole Interior," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 171301 (2013) [arXiv:1307.4706 [hep-th]].

[10] R. Brustein and A. J. M. Medved, "Black holes as collapsed polymers," arXiv:1602.07706 [hep-th].

[11] L. Alberte, R. Brustein, A. Khmelnitsky and A. J. M. Medved, "Density matrix of black hole radiation," JHEP **1508**, 015 (2015) [arXiv:1502.02687 [hep-th]].

[12] S. Fubini and G. Veneziano, "Level structure of dual resonance models," Nuovo Cimento **64A**, 1640 (1969).

[13] D. Mitchell and N. Turok, "Statistical mechanics of cosmic strings," Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1577 (1987); "Statistical properties of cosmic strings," Nucl. Phys. B **294**, 1138 (1987).

[14] J. J. Atick and E. Witten, "The Hagedorn transition and the number of degrees of freedom in string theory," Nucl. Phys. B **310**, 291 (1988).

[15] N. Deo, S. Jain and C.-I. Tan "String distributions above Hagedorn energy density," Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2626 (1989).

[16] R. Brandenberger and C. Vafa, "Superstrings in the early universe," Nucl. Phys. B **316**, 391 (1989).

[17] G. T. Horowitz and J. Polchinski, "Selfgravitating fundamental strings," Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2557 (1998) [hep-th/9707170].

[18] P. Salomonson and B.-S. Skagerstam, "On superdense superstring gases: A heretic string model approach," Nucl. Phys. B **268**, 349 (1986).

[19] D. A. Lowe and L. Thorlacius, "Hot string soup," Phys. Rev. D **51**, 665 (1995) [hep-th/9408134].

[20] L. Susskind, "Some speculations about black hole entropy in string theory," In *Teitelboim, C. (ed.): The black hole* 118-131 [hep-th/9309145].

[21] G. T. Horowitz and J. Polchinski, "A Correspondence principle for black holes and strings," Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6189 (1997) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.55.6189 [hep-th/9612146].

[22] T. Damour and G. Veneziano, "Selfgravitating fundamental strings and black holes," Nucl. Phys. B **568**, 93 (2000) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00596-9 [hep-th/9907030].

[23] J. D. Bekenstein, "Black holes and entropy," Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973).

[24] S. W. Hawking, "Black hole explosions", Nature **248**, 30 (1974); "Particle creation by black holes", Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[25] C. Williams, F. Brochard and H. L. Frisch, "'Polymer Collapse," Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **32**, 433 (1981).

[26] R. Brustein and G. Veneziano, "A Causal entropy bound," Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5695 (2000) [hep-th/9912055].

[27] R. Brustein and M. Schmidt-Sommerfeld, "Universe Explosions," JHEP **1307**, 047 (2013) [arXiv:1209.5222 [hep-th]].

[28] R. Brustein and M. Hadad, "Wave function of the quantum black hole," Phys. Lett. B **718**, 653 (2012) [arXiv:1202.5273 [hep-th]].

[29] R. Brustein, "Origin of the blackhole information paradox," Fortsch. Phys. **62**, 255 (2014) [arXiv:1209.2686 [hep-th]].

[30] R. Brustein and A. J. M. Medved, "Semiclassical black holes expose forbidden charges and censor divergent densities," JHEP **1309**, 108 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6086 [hep-th]].

[31] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, "Black holes as mirrors: Quantum information in random subsystems," JHEP **0709**, 120 (2007) [arXiv:0708.4025 [hep-th]].

[32] Y. Sekino and L. Susskind, "Fast Scramblers," JHEP **0810**, 065 (2008) [arXiv:0808.2096 [hep-th]].

[33] L. Susskind, "Addendum to Fast Scramblers," arXiv:1101.6048 [hep-th].

[34] J. Maldacena, S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, "A bound on chaos," arXiv:1503.01409 [hep-th].

[35] K. S. Thorne, R. H. Price, D. A. Macdonald, *Black Hole: The Membrane Paradigm, New Haven* (Yale University Press, London, 1986).

[36] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "The Shear viscosity of strongly coupled N=4 supersymmetric Yang-Mills plasma," Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 081601 (2001) [hep-th/0104066].

[37] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "Viscosity in strongly interacting quantum field theories from black hole physics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005) [hep-th/0405231].

[38] M. Visser, "Physical observability of horizons," Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 12, 127502 (2014) [arXiv:1407.7295 [gr-qc]].

[39] S. W. Hawking, "Breakdown of Predictability in Gravitational Collapse," Phys. Rev. D **14**, 2460 (1976).

[40] B. Swingle, G. Bentsen, M. Schleier-Smith and P. Hayden, "Measuring the scrambling of quantum information," arXiv:1602.06271 [quant-ph].

[41] B. Michel, J. Polchinski, V. Rosenhaus and S. J. Suh, "Four-point function in the IOP matrix model," JHEP **1605**, 048 (2016) [arXiv:1602.06422 [hep-th]].

[42] K. G. Wilson and J. B. Kogut, "The Renormalization group and the epsilon expansion," Phys. Rept. **12**, 75 (1974). doi:10.1016/0370-1573(74)90023-4

[43] M. Creutz, "Gauge Fixing, the Transfer Matrix, and Confinement on a Lattice," Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1128 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.1128

[44] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer, "One-Parameter Scaling of Localization Length and Conductance in Disordered Systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. bf 47, 1546 (1981);

P. S. Davids, "Lyapunov exponent and transfer-matrix spectrum of the random binary alloy," Phys. Rev. B **52**, 4146 (1995).

[45] D. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen and G. P. Morriss, "Viscosity of a simple fluid from its maximal Lyapunov exponents," Phys. Rev. A **42**, 5990 (1990).

[46] R. Brustein and A. J. M. Medved, in preparation.

[47] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations], "Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 6, 061102 (2016) [arXiv:1602.03837 [gr-qc]].